Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—Yes.

Mr. RAME GOWDA.—Will not the revenue records show whether the present *atchkat* in any given case shows an increase over the extent originally fixed, and if so, will not the increase constitute in itself a reason for the inadequacy of the water supplied ?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—The question as it has been put suggests an elaborate survey of all the tanks which it is not possible to hold.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In view of the difficulties that are increasingly coming to the notice of the Government, will they be pleased to increase the grant for restoration of minor tanks ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That is a suggestion which Government may well consider.

Mr. Ballam SRINIVASA RAO.—In the case of a tank which gets silted up or becomes leaky within one or two years after restoration, should they not clear the silt and prevent the water from flowing out ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—The Chief Engineer will inquire into such cases.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Unless fresh silting up of restored tanks is prevented in some effective manner, will not all the expenditure incurred on their restoration be a mere waste ?

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Will it not be just and equitable to all concerned if restoration of minor tanks is undertaken according to a definite programme and on a districtwar basis, so that a definite number of tanks may be restored in each district every year ? Will it be right to spend away all the grant for any year on restoring tanks in only one or two taluks ?

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—Petitions are received from all parts and all the cases are examined and works taken up according to urgency.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Petitions have been submitted by the Nagamangala raiyats on a number of occasions, but the urgency of the cases concerned has not been realised. In the case of minor tanks at least, will the Government be pleased to reduce the rate of contribution ? The main reason for non-restoration seems to be that the payment of the contribution to the last pie is insisted upon and the raiyats are often unable to pay it in full. Government should not always be particular about enforcing the letter of the law.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—According to the scheme laid down for minor tank restoration, a contribution of one-fourth the estimated cost or all the excess over 24 years' assessment, whichever is less, has to be paid by the raiyats. How can the department execute the works if the contribution is not paid according to the raiyats' own *mutchalikas* ?

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—If the Government are so eager to enforce the letter of the law, why have they collected more than one-fourth from the parties ? Will the Government agree to pay back the difference in cases in which they have collected over and above the stipulated rates ?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—That question does not arise now.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—It is for regular restoration that the raiyats have to give the contribution. If it is merely a case of raising the waste-weir, why should contribution be collected ?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—In the case of restoration of minor tanks, the contribution is given in place of earth-work and turfing, etc., which the raiyats themselves have to do under the rules. Work is taken up according to urgency and in cases where the parties concerned are willing to pay contribution.

The Assembly rose for lunch at 3 p.m. and met again at 3-30 p.m.

Prohibition of Election Speeches.

Q.—4. Messrs. C. N. NARASINGA RAO and B. L. BYANNA (Bangalore City Municipality) ; B. MUNIVENKATAPPA and N. APPANNA REDDY (Bangalore Taluk) ; B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR and A. N. RAMA RAO (Special Interests) ; T. MADIAH

GOWDA (Channapatna Taluk) ; **B. CHOODE GOWDA** (Closept Taluk) ; **S. KARIYAPPA, V. L. CHAME GOWDA** and **Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA** (Kankanhalli Taluk) ; **Patel HANUME GOWDA** (Dodballapur Taluk) ; **GURUSWAMI GOWDA** (Hoskote Taluk) ; **A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA** (Devanahalli Taluk); **S. SARABHANNA** (Anekal Taluk) ; **B. MALLAPPA** and **A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA** (Nelamangala Taluk) ; **Patel HONNASIDDIAH** (Magadi Taluk) ; **A. M. VENKATASWAMAIYA** (Closepet Municipality) ; **K. P. PARASIVIAH** (Kankanhalli Municipality) : and **K. NARAYANA SETTY** (Magadi Municipality).

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they are aware of the orders of the District Magistrate of Mysore before the recent General Elections prohibiting Srimati Kamala Devi and Mr. K. T. Bhashyam Aiyangar and others from speaking at public meetings in Mysore City ;

(*b*) whether they are aware that the Town Hall in Mysore, which had been booked for the meeting in connection with the Elections, was found closed at the time the meeting had to be held ?

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—While issuing orders, was it the idea of the District Magistrate that particular persons should be prevented from speaking or that the meetings themselves should be prohibited ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The order was not meant to prevent election propaganda, but was passed for other reasons.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—But, had it not been announced previously that the meetings would be held solely in connection with elections ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Election propaganda might have been only one of the objects of the meetings.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Did not the Government peruse the notices announcing the meetings, and was it not evident therefrom that the meetings would be held solely in connection with elections ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Government did not pass any order. The authority who did it must, of course, have seen the notices and then passed the order.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Had the Government any initiative in the matter of issue of prohibitory orders ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot say that.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—When the orders of the District Magistrate of Mysore were only to the effect that particular persons should not speak at the meetings, why was the Town Hall, which had been booked for the meeting, closed ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The meeting itself was not likely to take place. What would have been the use of keeping the Town Hall open ?

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—In whose charge is the Town Hall ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In charge of the President of the Mysore City Municipal Council.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Had the President received any instructions from the District Magistrate in the matter of closing the Town Hall ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That is a question which had better be put to the President.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Is it not regrettable that Government should interfere in matters pertaining to elections ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Was not an open-air meeting held afterwards because the Town Hall was closed ? By closing the Town Hall, did the authorities prevent the meeting itself ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I do not know.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Why was the open-air meeting also not prohibited ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Probably there was no reason for doing so.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Was there an apprehension that if the meeting had been allowed to be held in the Town Hall, it would have resulted in a breach of the peace ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Did not the issue of orders prohibiting particular persons from speaking at the meeting virtually prevent so many other people from participating in the meeting?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The order of the District Magistrate had nothing to do with the holding of the meeting. Further, this is not the place for anybody to discuss the order of the District Magistrate.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—What exactly were the reasons for issuing the prohibitory orders?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The reasons cannot be discussed on the Floor of the House.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Did the District Magistrate explain the reasons to the President of the Municipal Council and did the latter inform the conveners of the meeting that for such and such reasons the meeting was prohibited?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot say.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Are the Government aware that permission had first been given to hold the meeting in the Town Hall?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I want notice.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Has the District Magistrate any control over the Town Hall?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In all matters governed by the Police Regulation, the District Magistrate has every jurisdiction over all parts of his district.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Can the District Magistrate order the closure of the Town Hall when the Municipal President, in whose direct charge it is, gives permission to hold a meeting in it?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I have already answered that question.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Will the Government be pleased to see that in future such things do not recur?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If similar reasons hold, similar action will have to be taken.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Do the Government consider that there were adequate reasons for preventing the meeting?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—You are entering into a discussion of the question.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that Srimati Kamala Devi is one of the most distinguished Indians and that she must have had good reasons for going over to Mysore?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Government are not aware.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—For what reasons was she prevented from speaking?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—For some good reasons.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—What were they?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot state them here.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Will not the curtailment of the liberty of speech cause bitterness in the minds of the people as a whole?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—There was no such thing in the case under reference. If at all, particular individuals might have resented the order.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Will the Government be pleased to see that, as far as possible, our liberty of speech is not curtailed?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Liberty of speech such as is permissible under the law of the land has at no time been curtailed.

Mr. H. K. VEERANNA GOWDA.—Had the District Magistrate made enquiries beforehand as to who were all the likely speakers at the meeting?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. H. K. VEERANNA GOWDA.—Was the Proprietor of the Krishna Bhavan Hotel also expected to speak at the meeting?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Notice.

Admissions to the School of Engineering, Bangalore.

Q.—6. Messrs. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA and A. N. RAMA RAO (Special Interests); B. L. BYANNA and C. N. NARASINGA